

THE LANCASTER GAZETTE.

THE UNION OF THE STATES—ONE COUNTRY—ONE DESTINY.

LANCASTER, OHIO, THURSDAY, JAN. 31, 1861.

NO. 44.

VOL. 1.

The Lancaster Gazette.

CLARKE, KOOKEN & SUTPHEN,
EDITORS & PROPRIETORS.

Office
Tallmadge Block—Third Story—to the
Left at the Head of the Stairs.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The Gazette will be published every Thursday, on the following terms:
One year in advance \$1.50
For the balance of the year, at the rate of 10 cents per month, but not less than \$1.00.
No discount on arrears or on advance payments.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

A square of 10 lines, or less, for the first week, \$1.00
For each additional week, 50 cents.
For each additional line, 10 cents.
All advertisements must be paid for in advance.

BOOK AND JOB PRINTING.

We are prepared to execute all descriptions of JOB WORK, such as CARDS, CIRCULARS, POSTERS, RAIL TICKETS, and every other variety of PRINTING, in the most durable manner, and at the lowest prices.

COUNTY OFFICERS.

Judge of the Probate Court—HENRY C. WHITMAN, residence Lancaster, Ohio.
County Judge—JESSE H. HARRIS, Office in Public Building.

Business Cards.

I. O. O. F.
CHARTER LODGE, No. 7, meets every Monday
at 7 o'clock.
ROCKBROOK CAMP, No. 28, meets
on 4th Thursday of each month.
Lancaster, April 18, 1860—41.

TALL SLOUGH,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

Prompt attention given to Collections.
T. P. FOSTER, with S. C. Clarke & Co.
March 22, 1860—41.

DR. A. C. BARLOW

PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.

Office—Tallmadge Block, Lancaster, Ohio.

DR. J. C. HAMILL,

DENTIST.

Office—Tallmadge Block, Lancaster, Ohio.

H. L. CRIDER,

RESIDENT DENTIST.

Office—Tallmadge Block, Lancaster, Ohio.

K. FRITTER,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

Insurance and Collecting Agent.

LANCASTER, OHIO.

STITCHCOB & CLARKE,

ATTORNEYS AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

VIRGIL E. SHAW,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

W. T. WISE,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

H. H. GIESY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

LANCASTER, OHIO.

For the Lancaster Gazette.

"Has a State the Right to Secede from the Union?"

Mass. Editors.—Those of your readers who noticed my former article upon the above question, which appeared in the Lancaster Gazette of the 27th ultimo, will perfectly agree with me, that a lengthy replication to the last communication of "T." would be utterly gratuitous. I shall therefore restrict the present article to the narrowest conventional limits; omitting altogether any notice of the dignified (!) remarks, and the very withering rebuke with which my aged adversary prefaced his last article. I do not know that I should regard it as meriting at my hands the least measure of consideration, were it not clearly obvious to me from a thorough reading of his article, that some explanation of my former communication is necessary—unless he designedly perverts its meaning—in order to bring it within the bounds of his comprehension. I have no small inclination to the belief, however, that his misrepresentations are willful;—because when a writer assumes to maintain position upon a given question, which is to himself manifestly untenable, he is naturally expected to avail himself of the service of any means, though ever so unfair, that will give to his argument the slightest air of plausibility. But a few explanations will suffice to clear away from the public mind the light spray of secessionism which the last feeble stroke of my adversary's pen has dashed over it.

In order that these explanations, and their application, may be plainly seen and fully understood, we quote from the objectionable paragraphs of "T." last article:

"His article is mainly made up of generalities and vague denials. * * *

"He even denies that the doctrine of State sovereignty is anywhere asserted in the Virginia resolutions of 1798, or that Madison ever advocated such a doctrine."

Here I must beg of "T." that he cast one more glance over my article, and possibly he will be able to discriminate between the argument in the body of it, and that in the closing part, which professes to be nothing more than a recapitulation of the points before made, coupled with a denial of one or two of his assertions, the untruth of which is within the knowledge of every one.

For the truth of my declaration that the Virginia Resolutions of '98 do not anywhere recognize or proclaim the doctrine of "State Sovereignty," or the right of State secession, and that Madison, the drawer-up of those resolutions, once and again expressly disavowed ever having advocated such doctrine, I refer for all who doubt it to the resolutions themselves, and to the following explicit language of Madison himself, as quoted by Thos. H. Benton in his "Thirty Years View, from a letter written by Madison to Joseph C. Cabell, in 1832. As this letter was written about the time the South Carolina Secession and Nullification doctrine was first promulgated, its sentiments are deserving of careful notice. Madison says to Mr. Cabell, "I congratulate you on the event which restores you to the public councils, where your services will be valuable, particularly in defending the Constitution and the Union against the false doctrines which assail them. That of Nullification seems to be generally abandoned in Virginia, by those who had most leaped toward it. But it still flourishes in the hot-bed where it sprang up. I know whence the idea could proceed that I conceived in the doctrine that although a State could not nullify a law of the Union, it had a right to secede from the Union. Both spring from the same poisonous root."

In speaking of the action of the Virginia Legislature on the resolutions of '98, Madison further says: "It is not probable that, in the adoption of the resolutions of 1798, such an idea as the South Carolina nullification ever entered the thoughts of a single member."

Mr. Benton (himself concurring with Mr. Madison's views) has many other extracts from Madison, upon the same subject, to the same effect.

Now, since the right of a State to nullify the laws of the Union, and to secede at pleasure from the same, inevitably follows from an admission of the doctrine of absolute State sovereignty, will it be claimed, can it be pretended, by any one in the face of Madison's positive declarations to the contrary, that he ever favored such a doctrine?—An affirmative answer would be the acme of absurdity. An eternal quietus is therefore put to this secession hobby.

"Mr. T. Slough does, however, make one important admission, by conceding that if the States are sovereign, the right of secession is a necessary consequence; but he denies that the States are sovereign, or that the Union is a compact formed between the States, and holds to the old federalist idea that our federal system is a consolidated government. He says: 'That sovereignty belongs to the whole people of the United States, and resides essentially in the body of the nation.' That is in the general government. A more fallacious doctrine was never uttered, and I am astonished how any one who has reflected on the nature of our institutions, or has studied the principles of our government, can hold that our Constitution was made, not by the States as such, but by the people of the United States as an aggregate mass. Mr. Slough argues upon the assumption that the general government is a party to the Constitutional compact, and by the terms of that compact assumed sovereign powers."

The general government can exercise no powers except what is expressly delegated to it by the States.

Mr. Slough, the people of each State have relinquished forever most of their sovereign powers. Can he show it in the bond? No! The States delegated certain powers but relinquished none—two words of very different meaning. The former means to instruct or appoint an agent to act for a principal; the latter is the yielding or giving up to the power of another. A very great distinction."

The above paragraph is a most egregious distortion of that portion of my

former communication, to which it relates. But there is an antagonism in this paragraph between the statements of "T." himself, which must be apparent to every one.

He first says that I deny that the Constitution is a compact of all, and in the next breath asserts that I contend that it is a compact, to which the general government is a party! evidently showing either a want of comprehension or a willful perversion of my definition and view of the Constitution and Government of the United States. The language employed by me, is that "the Constitution of the United States is, practically, a frame of government, both of the people and the States," and that so far as it operates directly on the people, (as in taxation, representation, &c.) it is a compact, a consolidated one!" Now this certainly indicates that "T." has a very imperfect notion of the nature of a consolidated government, or he could not without intentional misrepresentation, say that there is anything in my article which can be construed as favoring such an exposition of our system of government.

The establishment of a consolidated national government would have required a total destruction of State lines, as well as a concentration of all the powers of sovereignty into that one national government; whereas I have endeavored to show that the sovereign powers of the people of the United States are exercised by the general government and the State governments, considered together.

By sovereignty residing in the "body of the nation" was meant (as every man of any brains must have understood,) not that the general government was vested with all the sovereign powers, but that full sovereignty dwells, originally, in the body of the people of which the nation is composed. I have distinctly stated that the general and the State governments of the United States are merely the "mode" or the means by which "the people exercise sovereignty," but that to render our system of government "permanent," it was necessary for the people of the United States, when they established it, "to relinquish to the general government," (or if "T." pleases, to those agents whom the people should choose to administer it) "so much of their sovereignty as would sustain it."

I fully appreciate the distinction which "T." draws between the significance of the words "relinquish" and "delegate;" but I must ask to differ from him as to the appropriateness of that distinction in the premises. For, as was shown in my former article by facts derived from our history and Constitution, the "delegation of powers provided for in that instrument," was intended to be perpetual. Hence it may be truly said, that there is no distinction between the meaning of the word "delegate," as used in the Constitution, and that of the word "relinquish."

I might here close this article if it were not that I am reluctant to allow "T." to arrogate to his secession doctrine, the prestige of the cherished sentiments of our revered Washington and Jefferson! In claiming a concurrence of the views of these distinguished patriots, with his own, upon the question of the right of a State to withdraw from the Union, he certainly reaches the climax of misrepresentation. And to show how far they sustain (!) his opinions; and how widely they differ from the crude notions of "Young America," I copy the following extracts:

In his Farewell Address, Washington says: "It is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; denouncing whoever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the wretch who would attempt to subvert its union."

Thomas Jefferson, in his first Presidential inaugural Address, says: "We are all republicans, we are all federalists; if there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand, undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error or opinion may be tolerated, where reason is free to combat it."

A word in relation to the Calhoun Resolutions, which "T." quotes. Against these resolutions, properly interpreted, there is no objection. They refer evidently to the status of the States at the period between the adoption of the Articles of Confederation and the adoption of the present Constitution. Now no one is so ignorant as to dispute the fact, that during the interim between these acts of the North Carolina and Rhode Island in relation to the establishment of the Constitution. But can it be denied that, by the last act above mentioned, (the adoption of the Constitution), the status of the States in respect to their individual sovereignty, was changed; or that no State can now be sovereign, except within a certain limited sphere? I think it has been shown that this cannot be fairly controverted. I am compelled, however, to enter my most solemn protest against the recognition of Mr. Calhoun's position of government, as set forth by him in his famous "Resolutions on the powers of the Government," as the one to which the democratic party have ever been committed. These resolutions—generally known as the "Nullification resolutions"—were repudiated and disavowed by the democrats and whigs; and Thos. H. Benton says that General Jackson, who was then President of the United States threatened to have Mr. Calhoun arrested and tried for treason, for introducing into the Senate and circulating those resolutions. I am not, however, in the least degree surprised to find "T." endorsing Calhoun as his ideal statesman, and his true representative of his political creed—their views upon the subject of State Rights accord perfectly.

Having already noticed, at greater length

than was intended, this last production of my aged and therefore respected friend "T." I conclude, by expressing the hope that he may survive the "severe attack of rheumatism" brought upon him by his arduous labors in mastering the logic of Mr. Slough's mastery long years to enjoy the benighted blessings of a happy Union.

T. SLOUGH.

Fitch's Amendment of the Kansas Bill.

The following is the amendment to the Kansas Bill, offered in the Senate, by Mr. Fitch, of Indiana, and adopted:

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That from and after the admission of the State of Kansas, as hereinbefore provided, all the laws of the United States, which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within that State as in other States of the Union; and the State is hereby constituted a judicial district of the United States, within which a district court, with the like powers and jurisdiction as the district court of the United States for the district of Minnesota, shall be established; the judge, attorney, and marshal of the United States for the said district of Kansas shall reside within the same, and shall be entitled to the same compensation as the judge, attorney, and marshal of the district of Minnesota; and in all cases of appeal or writ of error heretofore prosecuted, and now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, upon any record from the Supreme Court of Kansas Territory, the mandate of execution or order of further proceedings shall be directed by the Supreme Court of the United States for the district of Kansas, or to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, as the nature of such appeal or writ of error may require; and each of those courts shall be the successor of the Supreme Court of Kansas Territory, as to all such cases, with full power to hear and determine the same, and to award means or final process thereon.

Sec. 5. And be it further enacted, That the judge of the district court for the district of Kansas, shall hold two regular terms of the said court annually, at the seat of government of the said State, to commence on the second Monday of—

—and in each year.

The following was the vote on the adoption of this amendment, which was really the postponement of the admission of Kansas:

YEAS—Messrs. Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Cleggman, Fitch, Green, Gwin, Humphill, Hunter, Iversen, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholas, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Salisbury, Sebastian, Sidel, Thompson, and Wigfall—29.

NAYS—Messrs. Anthony, Baker, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Colamer, Crittenden, Dixon, Duellist, Douglas, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, King, Morrill, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson—28.

Senate amendment agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLASS.—There is no necessity for delaying this bill, as it would be delayed by the adoption of the amendment. The Senator from Missouri well knows that this Kansas question has been here for years, and no considerations on earth could suffice to stop it in this body three years ago, when it came under the Lecompton Constitution. It was not stopped then to be amended for the want of judiciary or any other clauses; but it was forced through. We are told first, that Kansas must be kept out because her northern boundary is not right, when it is the same now as it was then; next, that she must be kept out because the Southern boundary is not right, though it is the same now as it was then; again, she must be kept out because of the Indian troubles, though the same objection existed then as now; and, again, she must be kept out because she had no population enough, though she has three times as many as were there then; and, finally, this bill must be delayed now because it does not contain a judiciary clause. I do not understand why these constant objections are being interposed to the admission of Kansas now, when none of them were presented in regard to the Lecompton Constitution, three years ago nor in regard to the admission of Oregon which has since taken place.

A Consented Compromise.

The Hon. E. J. MORRIS, of Philadelphia, a Representative in Congress, proposes the following as covering the whole ground of compromise:

ARTICLE XIII OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

"Neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature shall make any law respecting slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime; but Congress may pass laws for the suppression of the African slave trade, and the rendition of fugitives from labor or service in the States."

PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S ESCORT TO WASHINGTON.—The President elect will be escorted to Washington by the Springfield (Ill.) Zouaves. This company is composed of young men who have for some months past been under the instruction of Col. Ellsworth, and in drill they are said to be fully equal to the genuine original Zouaves.

A correspondent writing to the Dayton (Ill.) Gazette says: This company intends to do escort duty to the President elect on the 4th of March next, accompanying him to Washington, and returning by Philadelphia, New York, Albany, and New England, and are in a perfect state of drill, having already taken several prizes, and surprised the famous Chicago boys in their efficiency. They are commanded by Capt. Cook, a gentleman who understands the Zouave practice, and I doubt not will create a sensation while in Washington.

MY DAUGHTER MINNIE.

A few years ago—well it is not less than forty—my little home flock was led in the matter of years by my daughter Minnie—a pretty name, I always thought. Minnie was a good child, and being the first born, was half maternal in her management of the latter comers, even down to little "Pigeon," the latest and tiniest of all.

The picture of Minnie is just as fresh in my memory as though the forty years which have shimmered and evaporated since, had been weeks instead. But it is a father's eye which looks over these years at Minnie, and the beauty may be half fancy—a sort of affectionate illusion.—Those who love are transparent, you know—we who imagine it is a surface-lint, and surface-light of which we are thinking.

This much I know, Minnie was the best, most affectionate, and wildest of daughters—one of those spirited but dangerous little creatures upon whose enterprises and tact the greatest and strongest of us will involuntarily lean.

"Minnie, shall I wait five or six breaths in this skirt?" her mother would say. Looking up with just a little knitting of the forehead, after a moment's thought, Minnie would answer—

"I think five will do, mother; and five it was."

I can hear, even now, the voice of Minnie's mother—she has been gone twenty years, dear heart!—calling from the head of the stair:

"Minnie! say—Minnie?"

"What, Mother?"

"What shall we have for dinner to-day?"

"You are tired, mother; let's have a little ham and some eggs, with some peas from the garden, and bread." That settled the bill of fare.

And so it was through the living day, for in all the domestic policy Minnie, though only prima minister, possessed regal power.

At this time, this forty years ago, I was, of course, in the prime of life, and full of the cares and responsibilities which cluster and cling to one's household.

I was largely engaged in an active business, received some light evidences of public confidence; saw a large family coming up about me—from all of which my natural positiveness and force of character more or less strengthened.

One night, when the last candle had been extinguished and all had been hushed, my wife said, when some anxiety of tone—

"Hush! I felt very uneasy about our Minnie."

"Minnie? Why, what is the matter, is she sick?"

"No, she isn't sick but—"

"But, what, wife?"

"Why, Minnie is—I mean, she seems to be—well, I am afraid she likes Jimmy Brun."

"Jimmy Brun! She'd better not!"

"And I leaped to the floor, and walked to the window—"

"Jimmy Brun and our Minnie—a pretty natch!"

"I was afraid you would be disturbed, but don't take it so much to heart, husband, I dare say we can put a stop to it."

And a motherly sob came from the pillow.

"Put a stop to it! I guess I will. Jimmy Brun and our Minnie—I guess I will put a stop to it."

And who was Jimmy Brun? A young man of some two years' residence in the neighborhood, of good habits, so far as I knew, but altogether diametrically opposed to my taste, to my ideal of manliness. I had always worshipped business tact and enterprise.

It had taken me, when a penniless boy, and brought me up through countless difficulties to the position of influence. That which was found in my nature, when young was thus nourished and rooted; and the after years of struggling ripening into triumph.

The young man was of a literary turn of mind, and taught in an academy, was a writer, it was said, for one or two periodicals. There was an air of sentiment about him, in his looks and manners, which came precisely within the scope of my contempt.

I had known it in others—in strong business men—this utter contempt for the least possible manifestations of sentiment; for those unthrifty fellows who have never an eye to business, but hang upon the skirts of thought, elapse imagery and rite upon rhythm.

You may see it now every day in commercial antagonism of fact and fancy—of the figures which do the pages of the ledger and those which illumine lines of the poet. The muses frowned on me, said a German poet, for keeping account books! Undoubtedly. Nor is the knight of the balance sheet less intolerant toward those miserable fellows whose stock in trade can be stored within a very little cavity, just behind the fraternal bone.

My good wife had a time of it cooling me down, and preventing the adoption of most violent measures. Even when I had formally surrendered to her superior discretion, I chafed by times like a bear in a harness. If my wife had not almost been a larey in fact, I should certainly have broken into plunging even sooner than I did.

Minnie was taken one day into solitary conference by her mother, with only pique in the doorway as auditor. But the child, though she blushed very much, moved about from seat to seat, and tore pieces of paper into bits, declared she was heart-whole yet—as why shouldn't she be?—for Jimmy Brun had never said a word to her which any man might not have said to any maiden. So wife and I got easy again.

But what should I see, one evening at twilight, while sauntering out alone under the shadow of my own grove of forest oaks, not far from the house, but two figures sitting hither and thither among the distant trees. Like knives, as I

sat down on the ground and watched them; watched them nervously, glancingly, till I saw Jimmy Brun give Minnie a kiss on her lips, and lovingly after her, as he slipped away.

I was reclining upon the lawn upon her patch. Determined to meet and confront them, I sat and watched her coming.

Certainly Minnie's face never wore that expression before. It was not gleeful, but it was radiant, and her eyes, which were bent on the ground, and hence only visible as she came very near me, had a light and depth that I never saw before. She passed me; so utterly was the child absorbed in her own emotions.

"Minnie," I said, in a tone which startled myself, scarcely less than my child.

"Oh! and she sprang from the path as though the sound had been a rattle among the grass."

I raised myself slowly—I am very slow when very angry—and standing idly before her, glowered down into her eyes—Minnie's beautiful, living eyes—with a sternness which had never failed to terrify. But the child, though she trembled like an aspen at first, brought her father's spirit to the rescue, and in the strength of love and innocence, looked into her father's angry face with great composure.

I must not repeat the words that followed; they never shall be written; and would to God they had never been spoken.

Minnie had given him her heart, and would give her hand. How could she help it? Her father's anger should prevent her failing her word, for was not Jimmy Brun worthy, and was not her father's anger unreasonable and unjust?

All this she said to me with the deepest calmness of a perfect heroine, while I stood there almost as much astonished as angry.

"Wife, it's all up with Minnie," said I, striding into the sitting-room and breaking in upon a most delightful afternoon gossip, only relieved by the solemn ticking of the clock and the busy clicking of knitting needles.

"Lord! what's the matter?" and the ball of yarn rolled across the floor, while a clatter on the window fall, spilling and crushing